



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,538	11/12/2003	Arthur D. Johns	6678P001	9181
8791	7590	03/09/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			DOAN, ROBYN KIEU	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3732		
DATE MAILED: 03/09/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/712,538	JOHNS, ARTHUR D.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Robyn Doan	3732	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on Amendment filed 2/21/06.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-18 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-13 and 19-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: Attachment A.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's Amendment filed 2/21/06 has been entered and carefully considered.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C. 102 (b) rejection to claims 19-20 and 22-23 have been found to be persuasive, therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. Objections to the specification and the drawings have also been withdrawn. Arguments regarding the 35 U.S.C 112, second paragraph rejection to claims 8-9 and 13 have also been found to be persuasive based on applicant's remarks such as "desired volume, length and direction" being broadly including all volumes, lengths and directions; therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. Limitations of amended claims have not been found to be patentable over newly discovered art and claims 19-23 have also not been found to be patentable over newly discovered prior art, therefore, claims 1-13 and 19-23 are rejected under a new ground rejection as set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-9, 13 and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Imre (U. S. Pat. # 3,645,279).

With regard to claim 1, Imre discloses a wig (figs. 7-8) comprising a foundation (14b) having a peripheral member (25b, fig. 8, col. 4, lines 17-18) sized to be inherently capable of being worn on less than an entire portion of a scalp of a human head and enclose an occipital portion and a parietal portion of a human head. Applicant is noted that the claim limiting size by the relationship to anatomical features is as broad as there exists different anatomies, therefore, the claimed size "to be worn on less than an entire portion of a scalp of a human head and enclose an occipital portion and a parietal portion of a human head" is held to be as broad as there exists humans having different sizes, therefore, the shown device is inherently meets the claimed language. The intended use with a specific head is given no patentable weight. Imre also shows a longitudinal member (center member 32b, fig. 8) coupling to the peripheral member at a first point (Front portion fig. 8) and a second different point (at 24b) that bisects the peripheral member and defines a first portion (first half upper portion) and a second different portion (second half bottom portion) of the peripheral member. The wig further having a plurality of diagonal members (strips 28b toward to the front portion of the wig, fig. 8, it is also noted that "diagonal" typically is a straight line, however, Applicant has not specified its structure in the disclosure and the drawings shows diagonal members 150-1, 150-2 not being straight lines, therefore, it is proper to call strips 28b toward the front portion of the wig being diagonal member), each respectively coupled to the longitudinal member (32b) and the peripheral member (25b) distal from the longitudinal

member to divide the first and second portions into geometric regions (spaces defined between strips 28b and 32b) of a dimension suitable to allow natural hair of a wearer to be drawn through the geometric regions (col. 4, lines 5-8); Imre also shows a plurality of wefts hair (12) coupled to the plurality of diagonal members (col. 4, lines 31-32). In regard to claims 4, Imre discloses the first portion (first half upper portion, see attachment A) of the peripheral member being capable to be positioned on a crown portion of an individual wearer's head between an occipital bone and a top of a parietal portion of the wearer's head (same analysis as discussed above in claim 1). In regard to claim 5, Imre shows the second portion (second half bottom portion, see attachment A) of the peripheral member inherently encloses a nape portion of an individual wearer's head between an occipital bone and a base of the individual wearer's scalp (same analysis as discussed above in claim 1). In regard to claims 6-7, Imre shows the geometric regions of the first and second portions include triangles, spherical triangles (see attachment A) in view of Applicant's definition about triangles (specification, pages 7-8, paragraph 33). In regard to claim 8, Imre discloses the first portion of the peripheral member being capable to be positioned on a crown portion of an individual wearer's head and a number of geometric regions (spaces, see attachment A) within the first portion being selected to achieve a desired volume (any volume) of an individual wearer's hair (col. 1, lines 55-59). In regard to claim 9, Imre further shows a number of geometric region being within a second portion (attachment A) and also with regard to limitations "is determined based on a desired length of the individual wearer's head" which appears to be directed to a method of using and not to the actual structure of the

device, thus, it has been given no weight. With regard to claim 13, Imre discloses the wefts of hair (12) being attached in a desired direction (any direction, figs. 4-5, col. 4, lines 31-35) according to a style desired by an individual wearer. In regard to claim 19, by showing the above device, Imre shows coupling a device (wig 10) to an individual wearer's hair using an attachment device (elastic strip 24, col. 2, lines 37-40), applying outside pressure (by pulling legs 20 downwardly, col. 2, lines 49-55) to a foundation (14) to inherently cause the foundation to conform to the contours of the individual wearer's head and drawing the individual wearer's hair through geometric regions (spaces between intersecting strips 28b, 32b, fig. 8) to blend the individual wearer's hair with wefts of hair (12) sewn to the device (col. 2, lines 24-25). In regard to claim 20, Imre shows the device (10) being coupled at a crown portion of an individual wearer's head, see fig. 1. In regard to claim 21, Imre shows the individual wearer's hair being drawn through triangular geometric regions (attachment A shows triangular regions, col. 4, lines 1-8) of the device in order to obscure the foundation of the device. In regard to claim 22, Imre discloses a first portion (first upper half portion of the peripheral member 25b, fig. 8) of the device inherently capable of attaching to a crown portion of the individual wearer's head between an occipital bone and a top of a parietal portion of the wearer's head (same analysis as discussed above in claim 1). In regard to claim 23, Imre also shows a second portion (second half bottom portion of peripheral member 25b, fig. 8) of the device inherently capable of enclosing a nape portion of an individual wearer's head between an occipital bone and a base of the individual wearer's scalp (same analysis as discussed above in claim 1).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imre in view of Ensminger (U.S. Pat. # 3,628,546).

With regard to claim 2, Imre discloses a wig comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for the peripheral member having a wire. Ensminger discloses a wiglets (fig. 1) comprising a peripheral member (10, figs. 2 and 5) having a wire (col. 2, lines 24-25). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the wire peripheral member as taught by Ensminger into the device of Imre in order to enhance the durability and flexibility to the device.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imre in view of Narwick (U.S. Pat. # 5,873,373).

With regard to claim 3, Imre discloses a wig comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for a clip coupled to a portion of the peripheral

member adapted to engage a portion of the wearer's head. Narwick discloses a wig (figs. 2 and 3b) comprising a peripheral member (26, fig. 2) including clip (30 fig. 3b, col. 3, lines 66-67 and col. 4, line 1 and lines 5-6). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the clip as taught by Narwick into the peripheral member of Imre in order to better hold the wig to the wearer's head.

Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Imre in view of Yonezo Ito (U. S. Pat. # 3,435,832).

With regard to claims 10-12, Imre discloses a wig comprising all the claimed limitations in claim 1 as discussed above except for the foundation having a cloth material coupled at adjacent opposing side edges of the cloth material (claim 10); Imre also does not disclose the foundation including a wire and the cloth material surrounds the wire (claim 11) and wherein the plurality of weft hairs being coupled to the cloth material such that a weft portion of the plurality of wefts contact a first side of the cloth material and a different side of the cloth material (claim 12). Yonezo Ito discloses a wig framework (fig. 1) comprising a frame (1) being made of wire (steel, col. 1, lines 66-68), the framework having a cloth material (5) coupled at adjacent opposing side edges of the cloth material (col. 2, lines 33-35) and the cloth material surrounds the wire frame (col. 2, lines 29-30). Yonezo Ito also shows a plurality of hair coupled to the cloth material (fig. 1, col. 2, lines 29-30) such that the hair being in contact to one side of the cloth material. Yonezo Ito further shows additional cloth (9) being provided (col. 2, lines

44-49) therefore forming a portion of a hair contact a first side of the cloth material (5) and a different side of cloth material (9). It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Yonezo Ito by providing a cloth material to cover the wire frame as well as the hairs into the wig with wefts of hair of Imre for the purpose of providing a comfortable feeling to the wearer. Also, with regard to the limitations "such that a weft portion of the plurality of wefts contact a first side of the cloth material and a different side of the cloth material" of the claim 12 Applicant has not disclosed that placing the hair wefts contacting a first side and a different side of the cloth material provides an advantage, is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Therefore, it would have been *prima facie* obvious to modify the hair of Yonezo Ito contacting different sides of the cloth material since such a modification would involved a mere design choice and one would expect an equivalent effect with the modified component.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 and 19-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robyn Doan whose telephone number is (571) 272-4711. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on (571) 272-4720. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Robyn Doan  
Examiner  
Art Unit 3732


Attachment  
A

Fig. 7.




Fig. 8.

INVENTOR.  
JULIUS IMREBY  
Pleacher & Saulsbury  
ATTORNEYS